

Illinois State Legislature in 1914 and subsequently served as deputy county clerk. His many years of outstanding service in public life are a benediction to his memory and will be an inspiration to those who continue in his absence.

Having had the privilege of knowing this man, whose wisdom I shall long remember, I know he will be sorely missed by those who were near and dear to him. However, his ability, his accomplishments, his constructiveness, his noble character, and all that he stood for, will be an everlasting monument of his life on earth. It is with this thought in mind that I call your attention to this man who served the public as we now do to give us strength to carry on with our task.

#### FIREARMS LEGISLATION

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late concerning firearms legislation. The most knowledgeable and influential group that is directly concerned with this subject is the National Rifle Association.

In the January 1964 issue of their publication, the American Rifleman, they outlined their position which I would like to bring to the attention of all Members.

#### REALISTIC FIREARMS CONTROLS

The American people and the peoples of the world mourn the death of President John F. Kennedy. This was an incredible tragedy which shocked all civilized human beings. To those who treasure the right to keep and bear arms and the other basic American freedoms, the use of a rifle to assassinate our Nation's leader is a calamity added to our grief at his loss.

In this disturbing time, there is a tendency to seek a sweeping solution to crimes of violence. The days following the tragic events on November 22, 1963, saw the eruption in the press, radio, and television of a highly emotionalized reaction to the weapon with which the terrible deed was performed. Never before has there been such a wave of antifirearm feeling or such vocal and almost universal demand for tighter controls over the mail-order sales of guns. Although much of this was hysterical in nature, it has had its impact upon the U.S. Congress and it most certainly will have its impact upon the legislature of each of the 50 States.

No group of individuals has done more over the years, or is doing more now, to evaluate the problems related to firearms and to protect the right of law-abiding American citizens to keep and bear arms, than members of the National Rifle Association of America. The NRA believes that firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restrictions which such legislation places upon law-abiding citizens. Nevertheless, it does not oppose proposed legislation to prohibit the sale of firearms to persons who have been convicted of a crime of violence, fugitives from justice, mental incompetents, and other undesirables, or to proposed legislation to make the sale of firearms to juveniles subject to parental consent.

The National Rifle Association is opposed to the registration of the ownership of firearms at any level of government; to the requirement of a license to purchase or possess

a firearm; to control measures which levy discriminatory or punitive taxes or fees on the purchase or ownership of firearms; and to legislation which denies or interferes with individual rights of our citizens or is designed for the purpose of circumventing due process of law.

Reputable gun owners maintain that legislation should not be aimed at the firearm but at its misuse. The NRA does not oppose reasonable legislation regulating the carrying of a concealed handgun, but it does oppose the theory that a target shooter, a hunter, or a collector should be required to meet the same conditions. It strongly supports legislation providing severe additional penalties for the use of a dangerous weapon in the commission of a crime.

It is certain that antifirearm sentiment will remain a vital problem for some time. Regardless of what the U.S. Congress may ultimately do in the way of Federal legislation, it is certain that many State legislatures will attempt solutions of one kind or another. Nothing in the present crisis has changed the fundamental policy of the National Rifle Association of America with respect to the purchase, possession, and use of firearms by law-abiding American citizens for lawful purposes.

It is important that each gun owner formulate a policy to govern his own thinking and that he accept the responsibility, as well as the privilege, of making his views known to his elected representatives. The time for hysteria and name calling is over. It is time now to point out calmly and logically the areas in which legislation is proper and effective in discouraging the ownership and misuse of firearms by criminals and other undesirables. The lawmakers must be enlightened on the views of reputable citizens who believe in the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America and who believe in the preservation of our heritage to keep and bear arms. Then, and only then, will we have the basis for developing realistic firearms controls.

#### AGRICULTURE IGNORED

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that President Johnson in his state of the Union message on yesterday did not even mention agriculture and its many problems. He made reference to practically every other segment of our economy which leads one to wonder whether or not the President is very much concerned about the welfare of the American farmer and his declining income.

Does not the President know that the cotton producers in this country are in trouble? Has he already forgotten that he himself and the Secretary of Agriculture are urging the Congress to enact new wheat legislation without delay? Does the President not know that increased meat imports from foreign countries are creating havoc and deep concern in the cattle producing areas of the country and that dairy farmers are also looking for some solution of their problems?

Yet the President makes no mention of the plight of the American farmer in his state of the Union message. Some explanation would seem to be fitting and proper.

#### THE STATE DEPARTMENT HANDLING OF OTEPKA CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain newspaper articles.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, articles in the Des Moines Register which relate interviews with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, John F. Reilly, and Elmer D. Hill, corroborate the allegation of our colleague, Representative CRAMER, of Florida, that Rusk has become a willing partner in the effort to oust a loyal State Department security official, Otto F. Otepka.

Taken together with transcripts of testimony from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, these articles establish:

First. Secretary Rusk has been aware of all the testimony and communications to the Senate subcommittee since the first week of last October when he was served notice that the subcommittee had evidence indicating perjury by some of his top employees.

Second. Secretary Rusk had specific knowledge of the testimony of Reilly, Hill, and David I. Belisle, given last July and August, in which they denied knowledge of any wiretaps or listening devices used on Otepka's telephone or in his office.

Third. With the transcripts of testimony by Reilly, Hill and Belisle available to him, Secretary Rusk permitted and even approved their letters of November 6, 1963, to the Senate subcommittee, in which they admitted listening devices were used on Otepka's telephone.

In these letters they tried to palm off their earlier testimony as correct; that they were merely seeking "to amplify" the record, but at the same time using this left-handed means of admitting their initial testimony was untrue. In other words, under oath they lied to the subcommittee.

Now there is additional testimony by Mr. Hill in which he admits actual recordings were made of Otepka's conversations, and Reilly and some other officials had knowledge of this.

To this date I have seen no criticism of Reilly, Belisle, and Hill by Secretary Rusk or by Deputy Under Secretary of State William Crockett. But the State Department is busy peddling stories to the public trying to discredit and defame Otepka, whose only offense has been telling the truth to a congressional committee about conditions in the Security Division of the State Department.

The record indicates that Rusk has the attitude that Reilly attributes to him when Reilly says he has not been criticized by high State Department officials for installing the listening device on Otepka's telephone or for giving untruthful testimony about it.

The fact that the inaccurate letters were written in the State Department's legal office, and approved by Secretary

January 9

Rusk, raises some extremely serious questions about this case—questions more serious than the propriety of the tactics used against Otepka and even more serious than the initial giving of lying statements before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I have long insisted that there should be a thorough and sweeping investigation of the State Department. I renew that insistence today and call upon President Johnson to take such action without further delay.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Dec. 25, 1963]

#### RUSK INSISTS HE HANDLES OTEPKA CASE (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk is personally responsible for the details of the handling of the Otepka case since October 5, he said Tuesday.

The Secretary said he has read all of the testimony made available to the State Department relative to untruthful testimony of three high State Department officials.

Under sharp pressure from Congress, Rusk forced the resignation of Deputy Assistant Secretary John P. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill, a special assistant to Reilly.

#### SPECIAL CASES

David Bellisle, chief assistant to Reilly, has been removed from any overall responsibility in the State Department Security Division, and "has been working on special security cases," the State Department reported Tuesday.

Rusk said he did not rely on subordinates to analyze the information on the handling of the Otepka case and the activities of Reilly, Hill, and Bellisle. He said transcripts of all testimony and other information was sent to him personally, and was read by him.

Secretary Rusk said he had approved letters Reilly, Hill, and Bellisle sent to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee November 6, 1963, to clarify their testimony of late July and early August.

In that testimony all three denied knowledge that wiretaps had been attached to the telephone of Chief Security Evaluator Otto Otepka.

#### NOVEMBER 6 LETTERS

Their November 6 letters admitted knowledge that a listening device was placed on Otepka's telephone for 3 days, from March 18 through March 20, 1963.

However, the letters denied knowledge of any other incidents that might be considered an effort to use a listening device on Otepka's telephone or to place a listening device in his office.

Since receiving those letters, the Internal Security Subcommittee has taken further testimony from Hill in which he admitted that there was further wiretapping of Otepka at Reilly's direction, and that an actual recording was made of the conversations.

Hill has testified that he turned these recordings over to some other State Department official at Reilly's direction. The State Department admits that Hill has changed his story and has stated that recordings were made, but contends there is still no evidence that knowledge of these recordings went to the Assistant Secretary of State or above.

#### DETAILS FROM DODD

Secretary Rusk contends that he had no knowledge of the basic allegations of "untruthful statements" by Reilly, Hill, and Bellisle until October 5, 1963, when a memorandum from the Senate Judiciary Committee was delivered to him in New York where he was attending a U.N. session.

Subcommittee Vice Chairman THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, delivered the letter to Rusk and explained the problem.

#### ORIGINAL STORY

Last July 9, Committee Counsel Jay Sourwine asked Hill:

"Did you ever have anything to do with placing a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?"

"HILL. No, sir."

"SOURWINE. Did you have any knowledge of it, if it was done?"

"HILL. No, sir."

#### REVISED VERSION

On November 6, Hill wrote to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that on March 18, Reilly asked him to explore the possibility of eavesdropping on conversations in Otepka's office. He said he discussed it with Clarence J. Schneider, Chief of Technical Operation Branch, and that they decided they could install a listening device in Otepka's telephone. Hill added:

"Mr. Schneider and I tested the system and found we would be unable to overhear conversations in Mr. Otepka's office, except actual telephone conversations, because electrical interference produced a loud buzzing sound. It was never contemplated that an attempt would be made just to monitor Mr. Otepka's telephone line in order to overhear conversations on it."

Hill stated that an effort was made to get some equipment to eliminate the buzzing sound, but on March 20, Reilly informed him that it would not be necessary to pursue the wiretap further because information had been obtained from Otepka's wastepaper burn bag indicating he was giving State Department information to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Hill now admits that he made a recording of conversations on Otepka's wire, and gave the recording to another man in Reilly's presence.

Reilly continues to testify under oath that no actual interceptions of conversations took place.

#### NOT REBUKED, SAYS REILLY

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—John P. Reilly said Thursday no one at the State Department is angered with him despite charges that he wiretapped chief security evaluator Otto Otepka and then lied about it.

Reilly said his resignation as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division was "voluntary," and involved no reprimand or other criticism from Secretary of State Dean Rusk or Deputy Under Secretary William Crockett.

"I resigned because I did not feel I could effectively serve Secretary Rusk in the light of the relations with the congressional committee," Reilly said.

#### REMAIN FRIENDLY

Despite the charges of the Senate Judiciary Committee that Reilly gave "untruthful" testimony under oath, Reilly said "there is nothing derogatory in my (personnel) record, and I don't believe there is any way in which my acts were regarded as improper by my superiors."

Reilly said he has continued to have amiable relations with Rusk and Crockett.

"I am sure that if you talk with Mr. Crockett, he will tell you nothing I did was regarded as wrong. There is no basic disagreement with my superiors. I don't think we find ourselves in an adversary position."

#### WIRETAP ISSUE

Reilly said he is "standing by" his testimony before the Senate International Security Subcommittee in which he denied that he had ever ordered a wiretap to be put on Otepka's telephone last March.

He has since admitted that a listening device was attached to Otepka's telephone, but contends it was attached for experimental purposes and with no intention to intercept or record the conversations.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, has said Elmer D. Hill, a former State Department electronics expert, testified he made several recordings at Reilly's instruction and turned them over to Reilly.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Jan. 2, 1963]

#### TELL OF REILLY'S UNDER-OATH DENIAL THAT HE RECORDED OTEPKA'S CALLS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released testimony Wednesday showing that John P. Reilly made statements under oath denying any recording of telephone conversations of Chief Security Evaluator Otto Otepka.

The transcript shows that members of the Senate committee have charged Reilly, a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, with being "evasive" and "misleading" in testimony last August in which he denied any listening devices were connected to Otepka's telephone.

#### ACTED AS LOOKOUT

Since then Reilly has admitted that he directed Elmer D. Hill, an electronics expert, to experiment with attachments on Otepka's telephone, and acted as a lookout in the hall when Hill and another technician disconnected the wires that had changed Otepka's telephone into a microphone.

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has contended that Reilly and other high State Department officials may be involved in perjury in denying the use of a listening device.

The new testimony shows that Reilly insisted on November 15 that there was no actual interception of Otepka's conversations.

The transcript shows that Reilly said "The darned thing (the listening equipment) didn't work."

Throughout his testimony, Reilly insisted that his August testimony was not false because in his mind Otepka's telephone was not "compromised."

Reilly insisted that when he answered questions in August, he regarded compromising of a telephone conversation as actually listening to conversations and divulging the contents of the conversation to others.

#### AUGUST TESTIMONY

In August, Reilly was asked: "Have you ever engaged in or ordered the bugging or tapping or otherwise compromising telephones or private conversations in the office of an employee of the State Department?"

Reilly answered: "No, sir."

When Counsel J. G. Sourwine asked again: "You never did?" Reilly replied: "That is right, sir."

Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, said that Reilly's performance "is a sad commentary" on high officials in the State Department.

"If we call people in high responsible positions in Government down here before this committee, trying to pursue our duties, and trying to get the truth, and then we find such evasion and such withholding and such technical excuses and alibis for not giving the committee the truth, I want to tell you gentlemen our task, our job is tremendous beyond comprehension."

Under questioning, Reilly said that when he went to the State Department he might have "semifacetiously" said that one of his duties was "to get Otepka."

However, he insisted that it was not a campaign to "get Otepka" that had resulted in the direction to Hill for the listening device on Otepka's telephone.

Otepka had been involved in policy differences on security matters with Reilly and with Reilly's predecessor, William Boswell.

Otepka objected to what he considered to be lax standards in the use of "emergency

security clearance" on 150 occasions in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, compared with only 5 such emergency clearances in the entire Eisenhower administration.

#### WIELAND CASE

There also was some dispute over the handling of a number of cases, including the case of William Wieland, the controversial head of the Caribbean desk, who was under sharp criticism from Congress for his actions in connection with Fidel Castro's takeover in Cuba.

Otepka found that Wieland had not disclosed some facts in his background and had given misleading information on other matters, and recommended that Wieland be dropped as "unsuitable" because of a lack of judgment and lack of integrity. He did not find Wieland disloyal.

Despite the Otepka recommendations, Wieland was retained in the Department and the case was closed. It is reported that Otepka became aware of some new information, and sought to have the Wieland case opened again.

Reilly states that last March he was not out to get Otepka, but "I was thinking of how I could ascertain whether or not Mr. Otepka was getting me."

Reilly testified that he believed Otepka was cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Committee, and was furnishing information to the committee to use in questioning Reilly and others.

Reilly said it is his view that Government employees have a responsibility not to tell Congress things that might embarrass either their superiors or their department.

#### EFFECTIVE WAY

On March 13, Reilly said he talked with his assistant, David I. Belisle, about ways of obtaining more information on Otepka's activity including a wiretap, a listening device in his room, and an examination of Otepka's wastepaper "burn bag."

On March 18, he said he directed Hill to experiment and find an effective way to monitor Otepka's conversations. At the same time, Reilly started a systematic search of Otepka's burn bag and this search resulted in a carbon paper that showed that Otepka had written a list of questions to be asked of his superiors.

Reilly said that many of these questions were asked of him when he appeared before the Senate Internal Security Committee later.

Reilly revealed that when he came to the State Department, in April 1962, his predecessor, Boswell, had indicated that he had been trying to get rid of Otepka because he regarded the veteran chief evaluator as troublesome.

Reilly said when he decided to use the listening devices on Otepka's telephone, he did not consult Deputy Under Secretary William Crockett or higher authority. However, he stated that when he obtained information that Otepka had furnished questions to Sourwine that he had the support of Crockett and the Department in steps taken to oust Otepka.

He said that Crockett is in sympathy with the effort to oust Otepka, and that he believes it is the Department policy to get rid of Otepka.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Dec. 28, 1963]

#### JOB HUNTER FEARS TALK ON WIRETAP (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Electronics expert Elmer Dewey (Bud) Hill said Friday wiretaps were used to make "several recordings" of conversations on the telephone of State Department security evaluator Otto Otepka.

However, the 34-year-old former State Department technician said he did not want

to discuss the details of conflicts between his story and the story of others in the State Department who deny recordings were made of Otepka's telephone conversations.

"I'm going to have to go out and get a job in private industry, and I don't want to get crosswise with the officials of the State Department," Hill said.

"I'm going to have to depend on the State Department for references and I don't want to make things any more difficult for them than I have to under the circumstances."

#### COULD BE ROUGH

He said "things could be pretty rough" in getting another job if his testimony makes it difficult for Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Deputy Undersecretary William Crockett, or John F. Reilly, recently resigned Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division.

"Reilly has his position to look out for, so does Crockett, and so does Secretary Rusk," Hill said. "I don't want to do anything that would put them in a more embarrassing situation."

Hill said he gave testimony last July in which he denied listening devices had been attached to Otepka's telephone "because it was what the Department wanted."

#### CHANGED STORY

He said he has changed his story to admit the actual recording of the Otepka telephone conversations "because I felt I had to tell the truth to avoid trouble."

However, he explained that he did not want to give any explanation of his dealing with State Department officials because this may irritate them and result in bad references.

"I've told the truth to the [Senate Internal Security] Subcommittee, and I don't want to give any more explanations unless I have consulted my lawyer," Hill said.

The transcript of the executive session testimony given by Hill has not been made public yet, but Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has made reference to it in a Senate floor speech.

#### DENIED KNOWLEDGE

Dodd said Reilly, Hill, and David I. Belisle, an assistant to Reilly, had testified in July and August "that they knew nothing about the installation of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office."

"Reilly and Belisle," he went on, "recalled before the committee (in mid-November), stated that none of Otepka's conversations had been overheard because of electronic difficulties."

Hill testified that tape recordings had been made of several conversations, that Reilly had expressed particular interest in one conversation, and that he had turned the tapes over to an unidentified third party at Reilly's direction.

Reilly continues to claim he had no knowledge that any recordings were made, and to deny that any recordings were ever given to him or delivered to others at his request. He and Hill resigned from the State Department.

Hill, a native of Los Angeles, Calif., received an M.A. degree from Stanford University in 1957. He had been a research associate at Stanford for more than 5 years when he was hired by the State Department in January 1962 as electronics expert for the Security Division.

#### BELISLE TALKS AN AFFRONT, PROBERS SAY: HEDGE ON WIRETAP HELD "INCREDIBLE"

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—State Department Security Specialist David I. Belisle admitted he was told last March of efforts to wiretap the telephone of Chief Security Evaluator Otto Otepka.

A transcript of testimony released Monday by the Senate Internal Security Committee showed that committee members regarded

Belisle as "evasive" and "untruthful" in making earlier denials that he had any information on the wiretaps.

#### TAKEN NOVEMBER 14

Belisle's testimony was taken November 14 in a closed session of the Senate Internal Security Committee after investigators had obtained conclusive evidence that a wiretap was placed on Otepka's telephone last March.

Although two persons involved in denial of knowledge of the wiretaps have resigned in the aftermath of Senate charges of "perjury," Secretary of State Dean Rusk has allowed Belisle to remain an official of the State Department.

In the transcript released Monday, Belisle told committee members he did not intend to be evasive or to mislead them last July 29 when he stated under oath that he had "no information" relative to a wiretap on Otepka's telephone.

Belisle insisted that he believed his testimony under oath did not require that he give "secondhand" or "hearsay" testimony when asked if he had any "information" about such wiretaps.

He explained that he heard about the wiretap from John F. Reilly, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the Security Division. Reilly told him of the wiretapping of Otepka's telephone a few days after the events, Belisle admitted.

#### "AN AFFRONT"

Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, declared that Belisle's testimony was "incredible" and "an affront" to the members of the committee.

MCCLELLAN declared that it was not "hearsay" testimony on the wiretaps when Belisle obtained his information from Reilly, the man who had directed the effort to tap Otepka's wire.

Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, said that under the Belisle theory on "hearsay" a witness could deny having information about a murder, even though he had been told about the crime by the murderer.

The transcript showed that the committee members uniformly regarded Belisle as being "evasive" and "untruthful" under oath in earlier testimony.

They regarded him as also lacking in frankness in continuing to insist that he was justified in not telling the committee "the whole truth" as required by his oath.

Under questioning, Belisle said "the whole intent [of the wiretap and searches of Otepka's office] was to determine what information he [Otepka] was giving to the [internal security] committee."

Belisle admitted that on March 13 he discussed with Reilly ways to determine what information Otepka might be giving to Congress.

#### THE CONVERSATION

In this conversation, Reilly discussed the possibility of using some listening device on Otepka's telephone or in his office at the State Department, and also mentioned that he might examine typewriter ribbons and carbon papers in Otepka's wastepaper "burn bag."

Belisle said he was in Costa Rica on March 18, 19, and 20 when Reilly directed Elmer D. (Bud) Hill, an electronics specialist, to experiment with a wiretap device on Otepka's telephone.

Belisle testified that Reilly told him of the effort a few days later and informed him it had not been highly successful.

(Belisle and Reilly continue to claim the wiretap effort was thwarted by a humming sound on the line. However, Senator DODD has made a Senate speech in which he says Hill has changed his story and now says that several recordings were made and were turned over to Reilly.)

In the face of his present admission of knowledge of the attempted wiretap on Otepka's telephone, Belisle continued to insist that he did not lie to the committee last August when he denied any knowledge.

WHAT HE SAID

At that time Belisle was asked by Chief Counsel Sourwine: "Do you have any information with respect to the tapping of the telephone of Mr. Otto Otepka?"

"No, sir," Belisle answered.

"Do you know whether this was done?"

Sourwine followed up.

"No, I do not," Belisle answered.

"Did you have anything to do with the placing of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?" Sourwine asked.

"I did not, sir," Belisle answered.

"Do you know if this was done?" Sourwine asked.

"I do not," Belisle answered.

After the State Department was notified that the Internal Security Committee had evidence establishing that a wiretap was placed on Otepka's telephone, Belisle wrote a letter to "amplify" his testimony, saying he had no "firsthand" knowledge.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Iowa for his efforts, despite the criticism, toward bringing all the facts to light, as the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body and also certain Members of the other body have been trying to do for some time. The facts the gentleman is putting into the Record at this time, I am confident, will help accomplish that. I, too, of course, have been subject to all sorts of criticism by the State Department for likewise having insisted that the truth of this matter be fully determined and that the American people be advised as to the truth. In my opinion, this is one of the grossest examples of attempted, purposeful coverup of the truth by the State Department in my memory.

Of course, let me say this, the reason I became interested in it and remain interested in it is because of the fundamentals, as I am sure the gentleman is likewise concerned about, that are involved in this particular case. There are basic fundamental principles involved here. Since when is the Congress of the United States through its properly constituted committees not permitted, because of some regulation in existence or other excuse in the executive branch of the Government, to inquire into the facts regarding information within the jurisdiction of that committee?

Mr. Otepka was called as a witness before the committee, was he not, I ask the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And he answered the questions posed to him by that committee, did he not?

Mr. GROSS. That is right. Under oath.

Mr. CRAMER. And he had no alternative but to answer the questions to the fullest extent of his knowledge, did he, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CRAMER. It appears to me—and I ask the gentleman if he does not agree with it—that the effort with regard to Otepka appears to be an intended, purposeful effort to try to intimidate other Government employees by making an example out of Otepka. Does it not appear to the gentleman from Iowa that is what it is?

Mr. GROSS. It certainly does.

Mr. CRAMER. It appears to me it is. Setting up Otepka as an example that, under the threat of being publicly discredited, in the future no other Federal employees should come before any committees and give information other than that previously approved by the agency, even though under oath and pursuant to the request of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right and especially so with respect to the State Department.

Mr. CRAMER. And does not the gentleman feel that unless the Congress of the United States, as the Internal Security Committee tried to do and as the gentleman is trying to do and as I am trying to do and as many Members of the other body have been trying to do, fully explores this thing and unless the facts are all brought out and the rights of Congress to investigate are protected, that other witnesses unquestionably would be intimidated with Otepka's firing under these circumstances?

Mr. GROSS. It would certainly have that effect. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman further believe no State Department investigative authority has the right under our separation of powers between the executive and the legislative and the acknowledged necessity for Congress to inquire into matters relating to legislation to investigate members of the staff of a Senate investigating committee, which even the State Department did not deny, when I charged them with that, in their statement in reply?

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman, and I compliment him for the information that he has provided to the House on this subject.

Mr. CRAMER. For instance, in reply to my charge that certain employees of the Senate committee had been under investigation by the State Department, the reply of the State Department was a denial that:

A State Department security officer or that the Department was investigating employees of the Senate Internal Security Committee.

I know the gentleman notices, as I do, how carefully worded that statement is—"was investigating," meaning present tense.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. It does not deny that they have in the past attempted to or in fact had investigated employees of a duly constituted congressional committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Therefore, the State Department did not deny that, but by implication it admitted it. It also admitted that the meeting to which I referred in my memorandum which I placed in the Record took place. They

admitted certain information I placed in the Record was correct but questioned some of the implications of it otherwise. I ask the gentleman this question further. I further charged at the time that it was my opinion that Mr. Rusk, who admittedly, as Secretary of State, has been in on this matter from the very beginning—and the gentleman from Iowa repeated that statement here today—is hardly an impartial person nor would anyone else in the State Department under his jurisdiction be an impartial person for investigating further all the facts of the Otepka case.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do. And the offer by Secretary Rusk to pick one of six employees within the Department of State to sit on his—Otepka's—appeal is a travesty. Employees of the State Department cannot be unprejudiced in this matter in the light of what has happened and has been demonstrated before the Senate Internal Security Committee. Otepka cannot possibly rest his case with any one of six persons or a dozen persons from within the State Department, selected by Secretary Rusk to sit on his case.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman agree that the State Department by handling it in this manner using a State Department employee as one of the investigators, are themselves opening themselves up to the charge, by their own action, of a whitewash of the entire case?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly so.

Mr. CRAMER. Does not the gentleman feel the simple way to avoid such a charge would be for the President to appoint an impartial review board with no relationship to the State Department and not under the jurisdiction or the control of Secretary Rusk if confidence in the State Department's action in this respect as well as in others among the American people is to be maintained?

Mr. GROSS. That is the only way Otto Otepka could begin to get a fair hearing on his appeal.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman further—and I am sure he is familiar with the most recent report and release of testimony from the Internal Security Committee with respect to the testimony of Mr. Belisle who, incidentally, even though, as the gentleman said, he lied before the committee—and I concur in the gentleman's conclusion—still the fact is he remains in the State Department. The other two gentlemen, Mr. Relly and Mr. Hill, who likewise falsified their statements before the committee are no longer with the Department. This is not only my charge, but it is a repetition of charges made in the other body as well—that falsification of testimony is obvious on the record.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And admitted in a left-handed way by the individuals themselves.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, by submitting a memorandum "clarifying" their testimony in the first instance before the committee.

1964

159

I said in my previous statement—and it has now been confirmed—that those clarifying statements were cleared over the desk of Secretary Rusk. Is that not the gentleman's information?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly correct—and also over the desk of the legal officer of the State Department.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes. The Internal Security Subcommittee, based upon sworn testimony, made the evidence available to the press and made certain statements concerning it this week. The committee said that the Belisle tale was "an affront" to the committee; that two persons involved in denial of knowledge of the wiretaps have resigned in the aftermath of Senate charges of perjury, that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has allowed Belisle to remain an official of the Department; that State Department security specialist David I. Belisle admitted he was told last March of efforts to wiretap the telephone of chief security evaluator Otto Otepka, which he had denied in the first instance before the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask the gentleman if he will ask unanimous consent to make this report on the committee's findings a part of the Record following his remarks?

Mr. GROSS. I already have that permission.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman on his efforts. It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of the gentleman, that the Johnson administration will take whatever steps are believed necessary as to appointing a truly impartial factfinding group that can get to the bottom of this question, to determine the true facts, and to make certain that the American people are fully informed and to make sure that the power and authority of the Congress to investigate is not prejudiced and that other Government employees are not intimidated by this action and, of equal and perhaps greater importance, that no injustice is done to Otto Otepka who has had more than 20 years of exemplary service in the Security Division of the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am under the impression that Mr. Otepka now has a case pending in one of the courts. Is that an erroneous impression?

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that he has yet taken his case to any court. He has an appeal pending as a result of his being ousted from the State Department, being fired from the State Department.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am under the impression that the ouster is now pending before the court.

Mr. GROSS. That may be the fact, but I am not aware of it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If this matter does not in fact get into court, would the gentleman be satisfied if an impartial committee were appointed to study all the facts in this matter?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, if a truly impartial committee were appointed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would see no objection to that and I do not believe Secretary Rusk would object. I believe this is a case which certainly has gained nationwide attention. Perhaps it would be an excellent idea to have an impartial committee appointed.

Mr. GROSS. It could not be truly impartial and be composed of anyone from the State Department, under the circumstances.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would have no objection to the appointment of an impartial group, totally disassociated from the State Department, to look into this matter to get to the bottom of this thing. It would not surprise me one bit to see the administration do just that.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, delivered a most interesting address at Carpenters' Hall, London, England, at the invitation of N. M. Rothschild & Sons and Model, Roland & Co. on December 9, 1963, on the subject, "The Program and Activities of the Federal Power Commission." This was a most interesting address at a most auspicious occasion. I call it to the attention of the Members of the Congress for their information.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that the estimated cost of having this interesting address printed in the Appendix of the Record is \$225. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON GENEVA SPACE RADIO COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE AND PROGRESS MADE IN ESTABLISHING GLOBAL COMMUNICATION SATELLITE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time today in order that I might give to the House information on some most interesting developments in the field of international telecommunications.

Today I have the privilege of reporting to you, Mr. Speaker, on the results of one of the most important and successful international conferences held in recent years, and the significance of that Conference to the establishment of a global satellite communications system.

May I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last Congress there was enacted a landmark piece of legislation. It was the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. Before beginning my report, I would like

to call attention to the declaration of policy and purpose of that far-reaching and important legislation.

In my judgment, those of us who have participated in the formulation, the enactment and finalization of that program during the last Congress helped to make history. In my judgment, the contributions which this program may make to the future of this country and our civilization cannot be anticipated at this moment. This communication program that we in this country developed and that we propose to utilize with other countries of the world may greatly affect the future of this Nation and of other peoples of the world.

#### DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to establish, in conjunction and in cooperation with other countries, as expeditiously as practicable a commercial communications satellite system, as part of an improved global communications network, which will be responsive to public needs and national objectives, which will serve the communication needs of the United States and other countries, and which will contribute to world peace and understanding.

(b) The new and expanded telecommunication services are to be made available as promptly as possible and are to be extended to provide global coverage at the earliest practicable date. In effectuating this program, care and attention will be directed toward providing such services to economically less developed countries and areas as well as those more highly developed, toward efficient and economical use of the electromagnetic frequency spectrum, and toward the reflection of the benefits of this new technology in both quality of services and charges for such services.

(c) In order to facilitate this development and to provide for the widest possible participation by private enterprise, United States participation in the global system shall be in the form of a private corporation, subject to appropriate governmental regulation. It is the intent of Congress that all authorized users shall have nondiscriminatory access to the system; that maximum competition be maintained in the provision of equipment and services utilized by the system; that the corporation created under this Act be so organized and operated as to maintain and strengthen competition in the provision of communications services to the public; and that the activities of the corporation created under this Act and of the persons or companies participating in the ownership of the corporation shall be consistent with the Federal antitrust laws.

(d) It is not the intent of Congress by this Act to preclude the use of the communications satellite system for domestic communication services where consistent with the provisions of this Act nor to preclude the creation of additional communications satellite systems, if required to meet unique governmental needs or if otherwise required in the national interest.

It will be recalled that we had some difficulty formulating and finalizing this legislation. Our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings. It was considered over a period of several weeks in executive session. The appropriate committees of the other body and the other body discussed it at length before we finally concluded the consideration of this program. Even though there were serious questions raised during the course of this consideration, I think developments to date



have justified the action of our committee in arriving at its decision and they have justified the decision of the Congress in approving the establishment of an early global communication program.

That leads me to make this observation: So many times when we have the far-reaching, important landmark programs on which we are legislating, we do not proceed to follow through to see how they work out. But I told this House at the time that we were going to follow through. Because of the controversial nature of the program I felt it was the thing we should do.

We have followed through and kept up with the progress of this program. Let me say to you that has been remarkable. In my judgment it is proceeding along the lines that we intended. I am encouraged by the progress made thus far. There have been difficulties, to be sure. Many problems still have to be worked out, and many of them have been worked out. But as the declaration of policy states so positively and specifically, this program requires the cooperation of other countries if it is going to be successful, and we are making good progress toward that objective.

#### SPACE RADIO COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE

In the fall of last year, I had the great honor of being designated by the Speaker of this great body to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Space Radio Communication Conference held in Geneva, Switzerland, from October 7, 1963, through November 8, 1963. Our esteemed colleague on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, ABNER W. SIBAL, was designated to serve together with me on that delegation, and my good friend and committee colleague, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, was present as an observer during part of the time.

Technically the space radio conference is known as the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunication Union to Allocate Frequency Bands for Space Radio Communications. More specifically, the purpose of that conference was to secure agreement internationally with respect to the allocation of frequencies in the radio spectrum for satellite communications, space research, navigational satellites, meteorological satellites, telecommand, telemetry, tracking of space vehicles, amateur radio, and radio astronomy.

The importance which the United States attached to that conference was demonstrated by the composition and size of the U.S. delegation as well as the careful preparations which had gone into the formulation of the U.S. proposals to that conference.

Our delegation of some 30 persons from Government agencies, the Congress, industry and academic life was led by Mr. Joseph H. McConnell who had been given the status of a U.S. Ambassador. Mr. McConnell, at present president of Reynolds Metals Inc., has had extensive experience in the field of communications while serving from 1941 until 1949 as executive vice president of RCA-Victor, and as president of NBC until 1953. To assist him in connection with foreign policy matters, Ambassador Jacob D. Beam, a career diplomat with

extensive experience in dealing with Iron Curtain countries, was assigned as one of the two Vice Chairmen of the delegation. T. A. M. Craven, a former FCC Commissioner, with extensive background in international telecommunications matters was the second Vice Chairman of the delegation.

Outstanding technical experts and veterans in international telecommunications negotiations such as, William H. Watkins, Harry Fine, Wilfred Dean, Jr., Paul D. Miles, and Carl W. Loeber, were the U.S. spokesmen on important conference committees. A satellite policy group consisting of Chairman Henry of the FCC, Mr. Gilbert Carter of the State Department, Dr. Joseph V. Charyk, president, and Leonard H. Marks, director of the Communications Satellite Corp., was in constant touch with the delegates of the 70 other nations attending the conference. Their assignment was to familiarize these delegates with the U.S. plan for a global satellite system open to all nations wishing to participate.

The delegates whom I have named and numerous others, under the superb leadership of Mr. McConnell, worked untiringly, to bring about the successful conclusion of the conference which the late President Kennedy only 2 days before his tragic death characterized as "one of the most successful of its kind held in recent times."

President Kennedy's statement was made on November 20, 2 days before his assassination when he received a report from Mr. McConnell on the Geneva Conference. I insert at this point President Kennedy's statement as a part of my remarks:

#### STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I received a report today from Mr. Joseph McConnell, Chairman of the U.S. delegation at the recent Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference on Space Communications held in Geneva by the International Telecommunication Union. This Conference has been one of the most successful of its kind held in recent times. Mr. McConnell is commended for the outstanding leadership which he gave to the American delegation and for his many contributions to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

The Conference allocated frequencies for communications satellites and adopted procedures governing their use, thus clearing the way for the establishment of an efficient global communications system. The Conference also allocated frequencies for meteorological and navigational satellites, space research, and radio astronomy.

This Government and the U.S. Communications Satellite Corp. can now take practical steps, in cooperation with other governments and foreign business entities, to develop a single global commercial space communications system. It continues to be the policy of the United States that all countries which wish to participate in the ownership, management, and use of this system will have an opportunity to do so.

Aside from the many political, economic, and social benefits, effective satellite communications can improve international understanding by providing a broad new channel for the flow of information between peoples.

The many delegations which participated in the important work of this Conference are to be congratulated on its successful outcome.

The Conference agreed to set aside 2,800 megacycles for communications

satellite services. The United States had proposed 2,725 megacycles while the Soviet proposal was limited to 1,600 megacycles.

For the most part, the Soviet proposal was in frequency bands different from those proposed by the United States. Only 800 megacycles were common to both proposals.

Under these circumstances, it is most gratifying that the 2,800 megacycles agreed to by the conference include four 500 megacycle bands which were contained in the U.S. proposal.

I believe we may be justified in speculating that the Soviet's willingness actively to work for a compromise at the conference is due to their intention to offer keen competition to the United States and the free world in the communications satellite field.

At the Geneva Conference, the Soviet delegates remained noncommittal on the question of their willingness to participate in a global satellite system. In the spring of 1963, the U.S. Government had sent a communication to Moscow outlining the U.S. plans for a global communications satellite system and inviting the Soviet to participate. The Soviet Government replied that the plans were premature. When the question was reopened informally with the Soviet at the Geneva Conference, the official Soviet policy position remained unchanged, although there seemed to be considerable interest in the U.S. plans on the part of some of the Soviet technicians.

Incidentally, it should be mentioned that almost all of the delegations, other than our own, consisted exclusively of technicians attached to their respective telephone and telegraph administrations. This, again, is proof of our own policy of considering an early satellite communications system, a vital national objective within the framework of our foreign policy.

Apart from the question of the number of frequencies to be allocated for space communications, the Conference was called upon to consider the procedure to govern the use of the frequencies thus allocated. Several countries, including the Soviet, held out for provisional use only of the allocated frequencies pending a future planning conference. The U.S. position was that the use of the frequencies had to be sufficiently definitive to permit long-range planning and major investments in a global communications satellite system. Many of the nations represented at the Conference feared that the major nations with present satellite capacity might preempt the allocated frequencies, thus leaving the less developed and smaller nations in the position in which they find themselves now with regard to frequencies utilized for other radio services. The position of these nations was supported by a proposal submitted by the International Frequency Registration Board, a permanent organ of the International Telecommunications Union. The Board's proposal called for a future planning conference to decide on the definitive use of the frequencies which, under the Board's proposal, would be allocated only provisionally by the present Conference.